



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/253,048	02/19/1999	YASUHITO INAGAKI	9792909-4094	5170

7590 06/19/2003

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
8000 SEARS TOWER
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6404

EXAMINER

MARKOFF, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003

32

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/253,048

Applicant(s)

INAGAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander Markoff

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 42-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/31/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1746

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 42-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of EP 0 818 474, EP 0 818 420, and Inagaki et al (US Patent No 6,022,928) in view of DE 44 44 032, Elfine (US Patent No 4,902,665), Monick et al (US Patent No 4,765,908), Horton (US Patent No 4,619,744) and Ramirez et al (US Patent No 4,219,416) .

The applicants amended the claims. The instant claims do not contain new matter.

The following is the rejection based on the art.

It is noted that some of the art, which is used in this rejection, was previously applied to the claims, prior to the time at which the applicants introduced new matter to the claims. The other references have been discovered this time.

EP 0 818 474, EP 0 818 420 and Inagaki et al teach a method of obtaining polyelectrolytes and of the use of the obtained polyelectrolytes as absorbing agent in different processes.

The disclosed polyelectrolytes and the method of their production are the same as for the claimed hydrolyzed polymer. The starting material is disclosed as a waste or virgin material.

The cited references do not explicitly recite absorbing the claimed compounds. They, however, teach application of the electrolytes in different methods including treatment of waste water, absorbing, ion exchange, cement treatment, etc.

Art Unit: 1746

On the other hand, the use of polyelectrolytes for treatment to remove heavy metals and ammonia from different liquids and solids (including waste water) was conventional in the art as evidenced by DE 44 44 032, Elfine, Monick et al, Horton and Ramirez et al.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to absorb heavy metals by the polyelectrolytes disclosed by EP 0 818 474, EP 0 818 420 and Inagaki et al with reasonable expectation of adequate results, because DE 44 44 032, Elfine, Monick et al, Horton and Ramirez et al. disclose such application as conventional for polyelectrolytes.

As to claims 52 and 53 , which require pulverizing, melting and palletizing of the starting material:

EP 0 818 474 and Inagaki et al teach that the starting material can be in form of pellet, powder, molded article. They disclose different possible shapes for the starting material.

Having this teaching of the prior art, it would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to provide the starting material in the pellet form by any conventional method.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 703-308-7545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 6:00.

Art Unit: 1746

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on 703-308-4333.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.



Alexander Markoff
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

am
June 15, 2003

ALEXANDER MARKOFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER